



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/843,323	04/25/2001	Allan M. Radman	7103-200	8785

7590 01/24/2003

Linda D. Kennedy
Brinks Hofer Gilson & Lione
NBC Tower, Suite 3600
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610

EXAMINER

RACHUBA, MAURINA T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3723

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/843,323

Applicant(s)

RADMAN, ALLAN M.

Examiner

M Rachuba

Art Unit

3723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) g.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 15 repeats a limitation of claim 9, therefore it does not further limit the invention of claim 9.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 1-11, and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Kimura et al, 5,651,724. Please see columns 5 line 30 through 7 line 7. If not expressly disclosed, it is inherent that the pressure on the inner region of the wafer can be controlled to be less than the pressure on the periphery of the wafer, dependent on the polishing effects desired.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura et al, '724. '724 do not disclose that the polishing pad or the wafer is held stationary. One of ordinary skill in the art, recognizing that there must be relative

Art Unit: 3723

movement between the pad and the workpiece to polish the workpiece, would have considered it obvious to hold either the pad or the workpiece stationary, while rotating the other of the pad or the workpiece, to ensure relative motion, as one of several options in creating relative motion.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argues that Pasch et al, '692, do not disclose a first force greater than the second force applied to the wafer, the first force on the periphery of the wafer. The examiner agrees. Please refer to the new grounds above. It is noted that originally presented claim 15 limited the first force to being greater than the second force. As the amended claims now contain this limitation, and as it is not a new issue, this action is made non-final to allow applicants opportunity to respond.

Any inquiry concerning the content of this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Rachuba whose telephone number is (703) 308-1361. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 4:00 PM. Any inquiries concerning other than the content of this and previous communications, such as missing references or filed papers not acknowledged, should be directed to the Customer Service Representative, Tech Center 3700, (703) 306-5648.

Art Unit: 3723

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hail, can be reached on (703) 308-2687. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9302.

In lieu of mailing, it is encouraged that all formal responses be faxed to 703-872-9302.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

M. RACHUBA
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3723



mtr
January 21, 2003